arXiv:0806.2982v2 [quant-ph] 8 Oct 2008

Non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric and Hermitian Hamiltonians' correspondence: Isospectrality and mass signature

Omar Mustafa[1] and S.Habib Mazharimousavi[2]

Department of Physics, Eastern Mediterranean University,

G Magusa, North Cyprus, Mersin 10,Turkey

[1]E-mail: omar.mustafa@emu.edu.tr

[2]E-mail: habib.mazhari@emu.edu.tr

October 8, 2008

Abstract

A transformation of the form $x \to \pm iy \in i\mathbb{R}$; $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, or an equivalent similarity transformation with a metric operator η are shown to map non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonians into Hermitian partner Hamiltonians in Hilbert space. Isospectrality and mass signature are also discussed.

PACS codes: 03.65.Ge, 03.65.Ca

Keywords: non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonians, Hermitian partner Hamiltonians, isospectrality, mass signature.

1 Introduction

Recent developments on non-Hermitian Hamiltonians have documented that Hermiticity is no more a necessary condition to secure the reality of the spectrum [1-43]. Such developments are very much inspired by the nowadays known as the Bender's and Boettcher's [1] conjecture in relaxing Hermiticity condition and introducing the concept of $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric quantum mechanics (PTQM). Where, $\mathcal{P}$ denotes space reflection: $x \longrightarrow -x$ (i.e., parity operator) and $\mathcal{T}$ mimics the time-reversal: $i \longrightarrow -i$. More specifically, if $\rho = \mathcal{PT}$ and $\rho\, H\, \rho^{-1} = H$, then H is $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric. Moreover, if $\rho\, \Psi = \pm \Psi$ (i.e., Ψ retains $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetry) the eigenvalues of a $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonian are real, otherwise the eigenvalues come out in complex-conjugate pairs (a phenomenon known as spontaneous breakdown of $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetry).

Such a PTQM theory, nevertheless, has stimulated intensive research on the non-Hermitian Hamiltonians and led to the so-called pseudo-Hermitian Hamiltonians (i.e., Hamiltonians satisfying $\xi\, H\, \xi^{-1} = H^{\dagger}$ or $\xi\, H = H^{\dagger}\, \xi$, where ξ is a Hermitian invertible linear operator and $(^{\dagger})$ denotes the adjoint) by Mostafazadeh [20-25] which form a broader class of non-Hermitian Hamiltonians with real spectra that encloses within those $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric ones. Moreover, not restricting ξ to be Hermitian (cf., e.g., Bagchi and Quesne [38]), and linear and/or invertible (cf., e.g., Solombrino [32], Fityo [33], and Mustafa and Mazharimousavi [34-37]) would lead to real spectra.

In the process, on the other hand, some quantum mechanical models of certain exceptional $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric complex interactions, i.e., a $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric potential satisfies

$$\mathcal{PT} V(x) = V(x) \iff V(x) = [V(-x)]^{*}, \tag{1}$$

just happen to have their partners that are strictly equivalent to real potentials after being exposed to some supersymmetric quantum mechanical treatment [11] or integral, Fourier-like transformation [12]. Jones and Mateo [4] have, moreover, used a Darboux-type similarity transformation and have shown that for the Bender's and Boettcher's [1] non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonian $H = p^2 - g\,(ix)^N\,;\ N = 4$, there exists an equivalent Hermitian Hamiltonian $h = \sigma^{-1} H \sigma$; $\sigma = \exp\left(Q/2\right)$, where σ is Hermitian and positive definite. Similar proposal was carried out by Bender et al. [3]. For more details the reader is advised to refer to [3,4]. In our current methodical proposal, we try to have our input in this direction and fill this gap partially, at least.

Through the forthcoming proposition (in section 2) or through a similarity transformation (in section 3) with a metric operator η (defined in (21) below) we report that for every non-Hermitian complex $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonian (with positive mass $m = m_+ = +\left|m\right|$) there exists a Hermitian partner Hamiltonian (with negative mass $m = m_- = -\left|m\right|$) in Hilbert space $L^2\left(\mathbb{R}\right) = \mathcal{H}$. In section 3, we also discuss isospectrality and orthonormalization conditions associated with both the Hermitian partner (not necessarily $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric) and the non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonians. An obvious correspondence is constructed, therein. This has not been discussed elsewhere, to the best of our knowledge. We give our concluding remarks in section 4.

2 A transformation toy: $x \longrightarrow \pm iy\,;\ x,\, y \in \mathbb{R}$

In connection with an over simplified transformation toy $x \longrightarrow \pm iy \in i\mathbb{R};\ x,\, y \in \mathbb{R}$ ($x \longrightarrow \pm iy$ to be understood as $x \longrightarrow +iy$ and/or $x \longrightarrow -iy$), t' Hooft and Nobbenhuis [44] have used a complex space-time symmetry transformation

$$x \longrightarrow iy \Longleftrightarrow\ p_x \rightarrow -ip_y\,;\ x,\, y \in \mathbb{R},$$

between de-Sitter and anti-de-Sitter space to identify vacuum solutions with zero cosmological constant (used later on by Assis and Fring [45] to provide a simple proof of the reality of the spectrum of $p^2 + z^2 \left(iz\right)^{2m+1}$). However, in their instructive harmonic oscillator [44] example

$$H_x = \frac{p_x^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2} m\omega^2 x^2 = \omega \left(a_x^\dagger a_x + \frac{1}{2} \right), \tag{2}$$

with the annihilation and creation operators

$$a_x = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2m\omega}} \left(m\omega x + i p_x \right), \quad a_x^\dagger = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2m\omega}} \left(m\omega x - i p_x \right), \tag{3}$$

they have shown (using $x \longrightarrow iy$, $p_x \rightarrow -ip_y$) that the corresponding Hamiltonian reads

$$H_y = \omega \left(a_y^\dagger a_y - \frac{1}{2} \right), \tag{4}$$

with

$$a_y = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2m\omega}} \left(m\omega y + i p_y \right), \quad a_y^\dagger = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2m\omega}} \left(-m\omega y + i p_y \right). \tag{5}$$

Under such settings, $H_x \longrightarrow -H_y$ and whilst the eigenvalues of H_x are $[\omega \left(n + 1/2\right)]$ those of H_y read $[-\omega \left(n + 1/2\right)]$. Consequently, the ground state $\sim \exp\left(-m\omega x^2/2\right)$ in the x-space is normalizable, whereas the ground state $\sim \exp\left(+m\omega y^2/2\right)$ in the y-space is non-normalizable.

Within similar spiritual lines, Tanaka [46] has shown that a transformation of the form

$$x \in \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow -iy \in i\mathbb{R}, \quad p_x \longrightarrow i p_y \in i\mathbb{R} \tag{6}$$

would map a non-Hermitian PT-symmetric potential $V\left(x\right) \in \mathbb{C}$ (or any non-Hermitian PT-symmetric function $f\left(x\right) \in \mathbb{C}$ in general, so to speak) into a Hermitian (but not necessarily PT-symmetric) potential $V\left(y\right) \in \mathbb{R}$. The proof of which is straightforward. Using equation (1), one would write (with $z = -iy$

for simplicity of notations)

$$V\left(x\right)|_{x\rightarrow z}=\left[V\left(-x\right)\right]^{*}|_{x\rightarrow z}=V^{*}\left(-z^{*}\right). \tag{7}$$

This would in turn imply that

$$V\left(-iy\right)=V^{*}\left(-iy\right)\in\mathbb{R}\Longrightarrow V\left(y\right)=V^{*}\left(y\right)\in\mathbb{R}, \tag{8}$$

where $V\left(y\right)$ is a real-valued function, therefore. Some illustrative examples can be found section 6 of [46].

In this respect, a remedy for the t' Hooft and Nobbenhuis [44] harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian above may be sought in a mass parametrization recipe accompanied with the de-Sitter and anti-de-Sitter transformation $x\in\mathbb{R}\longrightarrow iy\in i\mathbb{R}$. That is,

$$m=m_{\pm}\Longrightarrow m=\begin{cases} m_{+}=+\left|m\right|>0 \\ m_{-}=-\left|m\right|<0 \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

Such a mass parametrization would, in turn, suggest that the t' Hooft and Nobbenhuis [44] harmonic oscillator

$$H_{x}=H_{x;m_{+}}=\frac{p_{x}^{2}}{2m_{+}}+\frac{1}{2}m_{+}\omega^{2}x^{2} \tag{10}$$

in (2) with $m_{+}=-m_{-}$ reads

$$H_{y;m_{-}}=\frac{p_{y}^{2}}{2m_{-}}+\frac{1}{2}m_{-}\omega^{2}y^{2}\ \in L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}\right)=\mathcal{H}. \tag{11}$$

In this case both $H_{x;m_{+}}$ and $H_{y;m_{-}}$ are isospectral and both admit normalizable eigenfunctions. For example, the ground state in x-space $\sim\exp\left(-m_{+}\omega x^{2}/2\right)$ and that in the y-space $\sim\exp\left(-m_{-}\omega y^{2}/2\right)$ are both normalizable. The mass

parametrization recipe does the trick, therefore.

Such observations would unavoidably manifest the following proposition.

Proposition 1 For every non-Hermitian complex $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonian with positive mass (i.e., $m = m_+ = +|m|$) there exists a Hermitian (but not necessarily isospectral neither necessarily $\mathcal{PT}$-*symmetric*) partner Hamiltonian with negative mass (i.e., $m = m_- = -|m|$) in Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R}) = \mathcal{H}$.

Proof. Let

$$H_{x;m_+} = \frac{p_x^2}{2m_+} + V(x;m_+) \;\; ; \;\; V(x;m_+) = V^*(-x;m_+) \in \mathbb{C}, \tag{12}$$

be a non-Hermitian complex $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonian (with $m = +|m|$) with a corresponding $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric eigenfunctions $\Psi(x;m_+)$ such that

$$H_{x;m_+}\Psi(x;m_+) = E_{m_+}\Psi(x;m_+).$$

Then a mapping of the sort

$$x \in \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \pm iy \in i\mathbb{R} \Longleftrightarrow \;\; p_x \longrightarrow \mp ip_y \in i\mathbb{R}\,;\; x,\, y \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{13}$$

would imply

$$H_{x;m_+}\Psi(x;m_+) = E_{m_+}\Psi(x;m_+) \Longleftrightarrow H_{y;m_-}\Phi(y;m_-) = E_{m_-}\Phi(y;m_-), \tag{14}$$

where the substitution $m_+ = -m_-$ is used and

$$H_{y;m_-} = \frac{p_y^2}{2m_-} + V(y;m_-) \;\; \in L^2(\mathbb{R})\,; \;\; V(y;m_-) = V^*(y;m_-) \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{15}$$

which is Hermitian (*but not necessarily isospectral with* $H_{x;m_+}$ *of (12) neither*

necessarily $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric). QED. ■

Illustrative examples are ample. In the complex "shifted by an imaginary constant" $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric oscillator Hamiltonian (cf., e.g., Mustafa and Znojil [18]) a companied by a properly regularized attractive/repulsive core (with the mass term kept intact)

$$H_{x;m_+} = \frac{p_x^2}{2m_+} + V(x;m_+) = \frac{p_x^2}{2m_+} + \frac{m_+\omega^2}{2}(x-ic)^2 + \frac{G(m_+,\alpha)}{(x-ic)^2}, \quad (16)$$

would, under the transformation $x \longrightarrow \pm iy$ and with

$$G(m_+,\alpha) = \frac{\hbar^2\left(\alpha^2-1/4\right)}{2m_+},$$

imply

$$V(y;m_+) = -\frac{m_+\omega^2}{2}(y\mp c)^2 - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_+}\frac{\left(\alpha^2-1/4\right)}{(y\mp c)^2} \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (17)$$

Which is not only real valued but also $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric (with parity performing reflection about $y=\pm c$ rather than $y=0$). In such a case,

$$H_{x;m_+} \longrightarrow H_{y;m_-} = -H_{y;m_+} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) = \mathcal{H}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_{y;m_-} &= \frac{P_y^2}{2m_-} + V(y;m_-) \\ &= \frac{P_y^2}{2m_-} + \frac{m_-\omega^2}{2}(y\mp c)^2 + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_-}\frac{\left(\alpha^2-1/4\right)}{(y\mp c)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Obviously, $H_{y;m_-}$ is not only Hermitian but also $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric and shares the

same eigenvalues with $H_{x;m_+}$ in (16), i.e.,

$$E_n = E_{m_+} = E_{m_-} = \begin{cases} 2n+1; \text{ for } \alpha = \pm 1/2, \\ 4n+2+2q\alpha; \text{ otherwise,} \end{cases} \qquad n = 0, 1, \cdots,$$

where $q = \pm 1$ denotes quasi-parity. Obviously the spectrum remains discrete, real, and bounded from below and the wave functions remain normalizable (cf., e.g., Znoijl [7] for more details), with a c shift of the coordinate up or down.

Moreover, the Bender's and Boettcher's [1] non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonian, with the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric potential $V(x) = -g(ix)^{\nu} \in \mathbb{C}; \nu, g \in \mathbb{R},\ \nu \geq 2,\ g > 0$,

$$H_{x;m_+} = \frac{p_x^2}{2m_+} + V(x; m_+) = \frac{p_x^2}{2m_+} - g(ix)^{\nu}, \tag{19}$$

would, under the transformation $x \longrightarrow -iy$, yield

$$H_{y;m_-} = \frac{P_y^2}{2m_-} + V(y; m_-) = \frac{P_y^2}{2m_-} - g(y)^{\nu}, \tag{20}$$

which is Hermitian (but non-$\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric for odd ν and $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric for even ν, i.e., conditional $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric). Whilst Hermiticity is secured in the partner Hermitian Hamiltonian, the boundary conditions and normalizability are not. Therefore isospectrality is a different issue that remains "to-be-determined" and to be partially discussed below.

The above were just few of the many examples available in the literature where their non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonians find Hermitian partners in the regular Hilbert space. Whenever one encounters such cases, the possibility of isospectrality should always be tested in the process. In the light of the above proposition, we may observe that our simple transformation toy $x \in \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \pm iy \in i\mathbb{R}$, could be interpreted as a counterclockwise/clockwise rota-

tion by $\theta = \pm\pi/2$ of the full real x-axis and would, effectively, just map a point $z_1 = x$ into a point $z_2 = \pm iy$ on the imaginary y-axis of the complex z- plane.

3 A similarity transformation toy: isospectrality and mass signature

In the search for a more technical metric operators' language, one may very well use Ben-Aryeh's and Barak's [5] similarity transformation with a metric operator

$$\eta = \exp\left(-i\beta\, x\partial_x\right)\ ; \quad \beta, x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{21}$$

Which transforms a power series

$$F\left(x\right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n\, x^n \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{22}$$

into

$$G\left(x\right) = \eta\, F\left(x\right)\, \eta^{-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n\, \left(e^{-i\beta}x\right)^n \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{23}$$

Where $G\left(x\right)$ is a non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric function and satisfies the similarity transformation relation $\eta^{-1}G\left(x\right)\, \eta = F\left(x\right) \in \mathbb{R}$. To reflect such a result onto the transformation toy in the above section we choose $\beta = \pm\pi/2$. This immediately mandates that a non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonian $H_{\mathcal{PT}}$ can be mapped into its partner Hermitian Hamiltonian H (*but not necessarily isospectral neither necessarily* $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric) through a similarity transformation

$$\eta^{-1} H_{\mathcal{PT}}\, \eta = H \iff H_{\mathcal{PT}} = \eta H \eta^{-1}. \tag{24}$$

Where

$$H_{\mathcal{PT}}=\frac{p_x^2}{2m_+}+V\left(x;m_+\right)\ ;\ V\left(x;m_+\right)=\left[V\left(-x;m_+\right)\right]^*\in\mathbb{C}, \tag{25}$$

and

$$H=\frac{p_x^2}{2m_-}+V\left(ix;m_-\right)\ \ ;\ \ V\left(ix;m_-\right)=V\left(x;m_-\right)=V^*\left(x;m_-\right)\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{26}$$

H denotes the Hermitian partner Hamiltonian in Hilbert space with real eigenvalues, therefore.

Under such settings, one can easily show that $\eta x\eta^{-1}=\pm ix$ (i.e., $x\rightarrow\pm ix$, which practically imitates our original transformation toy above) and consequently a non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric potential $V_{\mathcal{PT}}\left(x\right)$ would be transformed into its real-valued (by the virtue of equation (2)) partner potential $V\left(\pm ix;m_+\right)\in\mathbb{R}$ through the relation

$$\eta^{-1}V_{\mathcal{PT}}\left(x\right)\eta=\eta^{-1}V\left(x;m_+\right)\eta=V\left(\pm ix;m_+\right)=\left[V\left(\pm ix;m_+\right)\right]^*\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{27}$$

On the other hand, the proof of the related isospectrality between $H_{\mathcal{PT},m_+}$ in (25) and its Hermitian partner Hamiltonian H_{m_-} in (26) seems to be a straightforward one. Let E_{n,m_+} and $\Psi_n\left(x;m_+\right)$ be the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the complex $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonian $H_{\mathcal{PT},m_+}$, respectively, then

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\mathcal{PT},m_+}\Psi_n\left(x;m_+\right) &= E_{n,m_+}\Psi_n\left(x;m_+\right)\implies\\
\eta^{-1}\eta H_{m_+}\left[\eta^{-1}\Psi_n\left(x;m_+\right)\right] &= E_{n,m_+}\left[\eta^{-1}\Psi_n\left(x;m_+\right)\right]\implies\\
H_{m_+}\Phi_n\left(x;m_+\right) &= E_{n,m_+}\Phi_n\left(x;m_+\right)\Longrightarrow
\end{aligned}$$

$$H_{m_-}\Phi_n\left(x;m_-\right)=E_{n,m_-}\Phi_n\left(x;m_-\right), \tag{28}$$

where $\eta^{-1}\Psi_n(x;m_+) = \Phi_n(x;m_+) \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ are the eigenfunctions for H_{m_+} in the Hilbert space. Both the non-Hermitian complex $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonian $H_{\mathcal{PT},m_+}$ and its Hermitian partner Hamiltonian H_{m_+} are isospectral, therefore. Under such settings, we may observe that our examples in the previous section fit into such isospecrtrality argument, no doubt.

However, an immediate example on "temporary-fragile-isospectrality" may be sought in the complex $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric potential $V(x) = -A\,\mathrm{sech}^2(x-ic)$. Which upon the de-Sitter anti-de-Sitter transformation would be mapped into $V(x) = -A/\cos^2 x$ that manifests an unbounded spectrum because of the negative sign. Nonetheless, an immediate remedy may be sought in the parametrization of the coupling parameter, i.e., $A \longrightarrow -B \in \mathbb{R}$ (in analogy with the mass parametrization in (9)). This would, in turn, take $V(x) = -A/\cos^2 x$ (which does not support bound states) into $V(x) = B/\cos^2 x \in \mathbb{R}$ (which supports bound states).

In due course, we find that the complex $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonians find their Hermitian partners in the regular Hilbert space through either a simple transformation toy (13) or a similarity transformation toy (23) accompanied by a mass parametrization recipe (9) and/or an analogous coupling constant recipe is an unavoidable conclusion.

Nevertheless, having had established this fact, we may now try to explore the orthonormalization conditions. Since $\Phi_n(x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ are the eigenfunctions for H in Hilbert space, they satisfy the regular quantum mechanical orthonormalization condition

$$\langle \Phi_k(x) | \Phi_n(x) \rangle = \delta_{kn}. \tag{29}$$

Consequently, the established connection $\Phi_n(x) = \eta^{-1}\Psi_n(x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ would imply

$$\left\langle \eta^{-1}\Psi_k(x) \middle| \eta^{-1}\Psi_n(x) \right\rangle = \delta_{kn}. \tag{30}$$

Which in turn yields

$$\left\langle \Psi_k\left(x\right)\left|\mp i\eta^{-1}\left[\eta^{-1}\Psi_n\left(x\right)\right]\right.\right\rangle = \delta_{kn} \iff \left\langle \Psi_k\left(x\right)\left|\Psi_n\left(-x\right)\right.\right\rangle = \pm i\delta_{kn}. \quad (31)$$

An obvious and immediate correspondence between the regular quantum mechanical orthonormalization condition (20) and that associated with the non-Hermitian complex $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonians (22) is constructed, therefore. However, we could not find any example that may satisfy such a condition. The orthonormalizable set of wave functions satisfying this condition is an empty set. This should be anticipated since the normalizable wave functions of the Hermitian Hamiltonians are not expected to be safely transformed (along with the associated well-defined boundary conditions in Hilbert space) into the complex space.

4 Concluding remarks

In this work, we have introduced a simple transformation, $x \longrightarrow \pm iy\,;\ x,\, y \in \mathbb{R}$, that allowed non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonians to find their Hermitian (*but not necessarily isospectral neither necessarily* $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric) partners in Hilbert space. We have also introduced a similarity transformation recipe (with a metric operator η in (21)) that proved to provide a more mathematical accessibility to the orthonormalization conditions associated with both the Hermitian (not necessarily $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric) and the non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric (not necessarily isospectral) Hamiltonians.

Moreover, the parametrized-mass signature (an almost forgotten and usually deliberately dismissed for the sake of mathematical manipulation simplicity) is shown to play a significant role in the current methodical proposal. An analogous coupling parameter's recipe is shown to play a similar role as that of

the parametrized mass. Yet, within the lines of the later, Znojil [43] in his mass-sign duality proposal, has observed that the non-Hermitian cubic oscillator's Hamiltonians $H_{\pm} = p^2 \pm m^2 x^2 + i f x^3$ with opposite sign mass signatures are (up to a constant shift) isospectral. For the feasibly significant role it may play, the mass term should always be kept intact with the associated Hamiltonians, therefore.

Finally, as long as our non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonians $H_{\mathcal{PT}}$ find their Hermitian partners (*not necessarily isospectral neither necessarily* $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric) in the Hilbert space (where boundary conditions and consequently orthonormalizability are feasibly very well defined), either through a simple transformation toy (13) or a similarity transformation toy (23) accompanied by a mass parametrization recipe (9) and/or an analogous coupling constant recipes, the non-Hermitian $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric quantum mechanics remains safe and deserves to be advocated irrespective with the orthodoxal mathematical (though rather fragile) Hermiticity requirement.

References

[1] C M Bender and S Boettcher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80** (1998) 5243

[2] C M Bender, S Boettcher and P N Meisinger, J. Math. Phys. **40** (1999) 2201

[3] C M Bender et al., Phys Rev **D 74** (2006) 025016

[4] H F Jones and J Mateo, Phys Rev **D 73** (2006) 085002

[5] Y Ben-Aryeh and R Barak, Phys Lett **A 351** (2006) 388

[6] B Bagchi, F Cannata and C Quesne, Phys. Lett. **A 269** (2000) 79

[7] M Znojil, Phys. Lett. A **259** (1999) 220

[8] Z Ahmed, Phys. Lett. **A 287** (2001) 295

[9] Z Ahmed, Phys. Lett. **A 290** (2001)19

[10] A Khare and B P Mandal, Phys. Lett. **A 272** (2000) 53

[11] Andrianov A A, Ioffe M V, Cannata F and Dedonder J P (1999) Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A14** 2675

[12] V Buslaev and V Grecchi, J. Phys. **A**: Math. Gen. **26** (1993) 5541

[13] M Znojil and G Lévai, Phys. Lett. A **271** (2000) 327

[14] B Bagchi, S Mallik, C Quesne and R Roychoudhury, Phys. Lett. **A 289** (2001) 34

[15] P Dorey, C Dunning and R Tateo, J. Phys. **A**: Math. Gen. **34** (2001) 5679

[16] R Kretschmer and L Szymanowski, Czech. J.Phys **54** (2004) 71

[17] M Znojil, F Gemperle and O Mustafa, J. Phys. **A**: Math. Gen. **35** (2002) 5781

[18] O Mustafa and M Znojil, J. Phys. **A**: Math. Gen. **35** (2002) 8929

[19] B F Samsonov and P Roy, J. Phys. **A**: Math. Gen. **38** (2005) L249.

[20] A Mostafazadeh, J. Math. Phys. **43** (2002) 2814

[21] A Mostafazadeh, Nucl.Phys. **B 640** (2002) 419

[22] A Mostafazadeh, J. Math. Phys. **43** (2002) 205

[23] A Mostafazadeh, J. Math. Phys. **43** (2002) 3944

[24] A Mostafazadeh, J. Math. Phys. **44** (2003) 974

[25] A Mostafazadeh, J. Phys. **A**: Math. Gen. **38** (2005) 3213

[26] A Sinha and P Roy, Czech. J. Phys. **54** (2004) 129

[27] L Jiang, L Z Yi and C S Jia, Phys Lett **A 345** (2005) 279

[28] B P Mandal, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A 20** (2005) 655

[29] B Znojil, H Bíla and V Jakubsky, Czech. J. Phys. **54** (2004) 1143

[30] A Mostafazadeh and A Batal, J. Phys.**A**: Math. Gen. **37** (2004) 11645

[31] B Bagchi and C Quesne, Phys. Lett. **A 301** (2002) 173

[32] L Solombrino, J. Math. Phys. **43** (2002) 5439

[33] T V Fityo, J. Phys. **A**: Math. Gen. **35** (2002) 5893

[34] O Mustafa and S H Mazharimousavi, Czech. J. Phys. **56** (2006) 967 (arXiv: quant-ph/0603237)

[35] O Mustafa and S H Mazharimousavi, Phys. Lett. **A 357** (2006) 295 (arXiv: quant-ph/0604106)

[36] O Mustafa and S H Mazharimousavi, J. Phys. **A**: Math. Theor. **41** (2008) 244020: arXiv: quant-ph/0707.3738

[37] O Mustafa and S H Mazharimousavi, Int. J. Theor. Phys**. 47** (2008) 446: arXiv: quant-ph/0607030

[38] B Bagchi and C Quesne, Phys. Lett. **A 301** (2002) 173

[39] M Znojil, "$\mathcal{PT}$-symmetry, ghosts, supersymmetry and Klien-Gordon equation", (2004) arXiv: quant-ph/0408081

[40] C M Bender, D C Brody and H F Jones, Am. J. Phys. **71** (2003) 1095

[41] S H Mazharimousavi, J. Phys. **A**; Math. Theor., (2008) in press (arXiv: quant-ph/0801.1549)

[42] G Lévai, J. Phys. **A**: Math. Theor. **40** (2007) F273

[43] M Znojil, Adv. Studies Theor. Phys. **1** (2007) 407

[44] G. t' Hooft and S Nobbenhuis, Class. Quantum Grav. **23** (2006) 3819

[45] P E G Assis and A Fring, J. Phys. **A**: Math. Theor. **41** (2008) 244001

[46] T Tanaka, J. Phys.**A**: Math. Gen. **39** (2006) 14175